

## REMARKS

The Office Action included an objection to the abstract, comments about previously filed IDSes, a rejection of certain claims under Section 112(2), and rejections, under Section 103(a), of all claims. Applicant's response deals with each of these in the order presented.

### *The Abstract Objection*

Applicant has submitted an amended abstract which is less than 150 words.

### *Comments about the IDS*

With respect to paragraph 5 in the Office Action, the undersigned has previously filed many PCT search reports (in other applications) and these have been considered. Given the format of the 1449 form, Applicant submits that these reports were properly listed on the previously submitted 1449 forms and hence Applicant requests the Examiner to re-consider these reports. With respect to paragraph 6 in the Office Action, Applicant request clarification: did the Examiner not receive the copies?

### Section 112(2) Rejection

Without agreeing that the Section 112(2) rejection is proper, Applicant has deleted the language which was rejected in claims 13, 38 and 63.

### Section 103(a) Rejection

Paragraphs 11, 13, and 15 in the Office Action included section 103(a) rejections. In particular, claims 13-26, 38-51, 63-76, 88-14, 120 and 128 were rejected over Bodin in view of Bjork. Claims 115-117, 123 and 125 were rejected over Bodin in view of Bjork and Caruso. Claims 118, 119, 124, 126 and 127 were rejected over Bodin in view of Bjork and Caruso and Kurzweil.

Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections. There are numerous reasons why the claims are non-obvious over the references.

For example, Bodin teaches away from the claims because the claims include the limitation: “the image being rendered at the remote server from the entire document in response to the request.” Bodin is a system designed to reduce the storage required to store web pages. See, for example col. 1, lines 60-61; col. 2, lines 4-10; col. 5, lines 1-12. Bodin attempts to compress the various files which are used to create a web page BEFORE serving the web page, and the originals of these files are deleted or achieved after they are compressed. Hence, Bodin teaches away from creating the image (in a compressed format) in response to the requests.

Furthermore, the combination of the four references does not teach or suggest the following limitation in the claims: “wherein the device cannot determine which parts of the image are links to other web pages.” This limitation is described at, for example, page 10, lines 14-19, of the specification. Bodin’s implementation at the client system uses a conventional Java enabled web browser which recognizes the links (e.g., knows the content of the URL and can send the URL back to the server). Bjork also describes a client application which receives the links and recognizes those links; see, for example, the right column of page 188 (“The resulting cards, with supporting keywords and links, were then passed to the client.”) (Emphasis added). Bjork’s client includes a link view, Hence, Bjork’s client is like a conventional web browser in that it passes a URL of the link back to the server (rather than passing a location on the image). The Caruso and Kurzweil references also fail to disclose this limitation. Hence all of the claims are patentable over these references.


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time to respond, and a check for the extension fee is enclosed. Please charge deposit account 02-2666 for any shortage in fees associated with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 17, 2008

  
James C. Scheller, Jr.  
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
(408) 720-8300